The following PAMPHLETS, *written by* A. W. FARMER, *relating to the preſent Controverſy between* Great-Britain, *and the* Colonies, *are to be had of* RICHARDSON *and* URQUHART, *under the* Royal-Exchange.

1. FRIENDLY ADDRESS to all Reaſonable Americans, on the Subject of our Political Diſputes. Price 1 s.

2. FREE THOUGHTS on the Proceedings of the Continental Congreſs, held at Philadelphia, September 5, 1774. Price 1 s.

3. The CONGRESS CANVASSED: or, an Examination into the Conduct of the Delegates, at the grand Continental Congreſs, addreſſed to the Merchants of New-York. Price 1 s.

4. A VIEW of the CONTROVERSY between Great-Britain and her Colonies. Price 1 s. 6 d.

The following PAMPHLETS, written by
ANY. FARMER, relating to the present Contro-
versy between Great Britain, and her Colonies, are
to be had of RIVINGTON and URQUHART,
under the Royal-Exchange.

1. A MIDDLE ADDRESS, to all
Reasonable Americans, on the Subject of
our Political Dispute. Price 1s.

2. SOME THOUGHTS on the Proceedings
of the Continental Congress, held at Philadelphia,
September 5, 1774. Price 1s.

3. The CONGRESS CANVASSED:
or, an Examination into the Conduct of the De-
puties, at the grand Continental Congress, ad-
dressed to the Merchants of New-York. Price 1s.

4. A VIEW of the CONTROVERSY
between Great-Britain and her Colonies. Price
1s. 6d.

THOUGHTS

ON

AMERICA:

Together with

An Idea of CONCILIATION,

ADAPTED TO

The Natural and Legiſlative Rights of the COLONIES,

AND TO

The Supremacy of GREAT-BRITAIN.

Hear Reaſon, and let Juſtice hold the Scale. OTWAY.

LONDON.

PRINTED FOR J. BEW PATERNOSTER-ROW, 1776.

TO THE

Right Honorable Lord NORTH.

La Vertù eſt la ſeule Nobleſſe.

MY LORD,

ON the moſt candid inquiry into the actuating principles of your conduct, and the motives of your meaſures, the love of your country evidently appears to have been the primary and ultimate object of your views and ambition. From your firſt appearance on the vaſt theatre of political life to the preſent hour, in which you ſuſtain the principal character with honour to yourſelf, and advantage to the nation, your Lordſhip's mind ſeems to be animated with a noble zeal in the cauſe of virtue and of your country.

At an early period you ſtudied the laws of nations, and the commercial intereſt of your

your native kingdom; you ſoon DISTINGUISHED yourſelf in the Senate, your ſuperior talents and unvaried principles ſoon recommended you to a DISCERNING and AMIABLE Sovereign, who gave the world a ſtriking proof of his own underſtanding and penetration, and an inſtance of his attention to the happineſs of his ſubjects, by ſelecting a Nobleman of your Lordſhip's tranſcendent abilities to ſuperintend the affairs of this mighty empire.

The extenſive ſcience of FINANCE, which is the great object of a trading ſtate, was your Lordſhip's principal ſtudy. In that branch of uſeful knowledge you remarkably diſtinguiſhed yourſelf as Chancellor of the Exchequer, until the rage of PARTY, and the loud voice of FACTION called you forth to take a more active part in Adminiſtration. The taſk was arduous but perfectly ſuited to a GREAT MIND; it was impoſed by neceſſity, it was accepted with honour, and has been diſcharged with integrity. The love of your country inſpired virtuous ſentiments, and a warm attach-

attachment to the intereſts of a moſt amiable Monarch animated you with reſolution.

At the memorable period, when your predeceſſor quitted the high poſt of public honour, every circumſtance but the love of your King and Country, rendered acceptance of the dignity diſcouraging. Either the inexperience or the paſſions of the Noble Lord, or perhaps the temper of the times, had ſo CONVULSED the ſtate, that the affairs of the nation were thrown into the moſt diſtracted ſituation; at this critical juncture you ſtepped bravely forth, and in a ſhort time happily APPEASED the rage of party, and by ſteadily perſevering in the line of public virtue, you have REDUCED oppoſition to an empty ſound, and you have had the happineſs of ſettling the moſt important concerns of the ſtate on the firmeſt baſis.

Men of ſenſe and candor admire the SAGACITY, and extol the DISPATCH of your meaſures; on thoſe and other accounts the faithful hiſtorian will teach poſterity to revere the able Miniſter, whoſe maſterly abilities and inflexible virtue

brought

brought this country from a ſtate of anarchy and confuſion, into a ſituation the moſt ſecure and flouriſhing.

There ſeems, my Lord, only one thing more for you to accompliſh, in order to compleat the regulating plan adopted by your judicious Adminiſtration, and to enhance the glory of as good a prince as ever filled a Throne or ſwayed the Britiſh Scepter. The moſt important object now to be accompliſhed, is the adjuſtment of the diſputes between Great Britain and the Colonies, with as much ſagacity as you have adjuſted thoſe of the Eaſt India Company. Trade, manufactures, navigation, and, by conſequence, the REVENUES of this ſuperior commercial ſtate, are all involved in the diſpute with America. It is an unhappy miſunderſtanding, but it is an happineſs to be in ſuch good hands as your Lordſhip's. The PASSIONS of ſome men are ſtrong, the PREJUDICES of others are great, but, we may reaſonably hope, the VIRTUE of Lord North will be ſuperior to both, and ſurmount every difficulty that either ignorance, envy or malice,

malice, may throw in his way. PERSEVERANCE in a GOOD cauſe enſures ſucceſs: By a ſpirited PERSEVERANCE your Lordſhip will remove every OBSTACLE; and by keeping invariably to the line which you have judiciouſly marked out for your conduct, you will ſoon arrive at the temple of immortal fame.

A RECONCILIATION is devoutly to be wiſhed, but a reconciliation not brought about by haſty CONCESSIONS and the ſacrifice of Legiſlative Authority, which are the effects of timid minds and weak reſolutions; but ſuch a conciliation ſhould be aimed at as will manifeſtly tend to ſecure the NECESSARY authority of the State, and the happineſs of its ſubjects in general; a conciliation wiſely calculated to reſtore things to their NATURAL channel, and thereby preſerve the DIGNITY of the Mother Country, and the DEPENDENCY of her Colonies: This is the deſirable event, and a taſk worthy of a great FINANCIER. A nation's ſecurity and happineſs, your own character, and the honour of the crown, are all at

A ſtake:

ſtake: Your King, your country, and your reputation as a good man and a great Miniſter, demand an early exertion of your maſterly talents, and ſhould call forth all your virtue.

If, my Lord, you are inſpired with a noble ambition to be eſteemed the ableſt Financier in Europe, merit the appellation at a criſis ſo important as to engage the attention of all other European States, whoſe eyes are directed towards your Lordſhip. The diſpute concerns FINANCE as well as AUTHORITY, and therefore the occaſion requires all the abilities of an able Financier to ſettle the matter ſo judiciouſly as ſhall at once ſecure and promote our trade, manufactures, and revenue, and, by reſtoring peace, re-eſtabliſh the Supreme Authority or DIGNITY of Great Britain, and the natural and neceſſary DEPENDENCY and affections of America.

That "Virtue conſiſts in ACTION," and not in the looſe and noiſy Declamation of the Minority, is a truth univerſally allowed. A TALKING Virtue

tue is a SUSPECTED Virtue, and men who profeſs MUCH are often found to do LITTLE. Whilſt the enemies of your ſpirited meaſures make a parade of WORDS, which are more the tricks of the Head than the virtues of the Heart, Lord North diſtinguiſhes himſelf by ACTIONS which happily tend to the ſecurity and proſperity of his Majeſty's dominions. Perſevere, my Lord, in the path of honour in which you have hitherto trodden, and are now far advanced! Thus deſerve a Monarch's CONFIDENCE, and expect a Nation's PRAISE!

After ſo many ſingular inſtances as your Lordſhip has exhibited of Public Virtue, I venture to throw in my mite of commendation, which you are to accept, not as a tribute that bears ANY PROPORTION to your merit, but only as a teſtimony of the admiration, reverence, and eſteem in which I hold your Miniſterial Talents.

CORIOLANUS.

THOUGHTS

ON

AMERICA:

DIEU *defend le* DROIT.

MY LORD,

I Am not, in the leaſt, ſurprized at the miſunderſtanding which has long and unhappily ſubſiſted between Great-Britain and her Colonies; becauſe, I apprehend, their differences are owing to *natural* and perhaps to *inevitable Cauſes*; which may ſerve to convince our Government and the Eaſt-India Company, that vaſt territorial acquiſitions, eſpecially at a very great diſtance, are incompatible with the true intereſt of a great commercial State.

It is with Nations as with private Individuals; ſelf-preſervation and ſelf-love are the great ruling paſſions with the latter, and the

the great cementers of friendſhip and fidelity with the former; or, in other terms, they are the great governing Principles. And theſe leading motives being once removed, nations, like private perſons, will naturally and neceſſarily ſhake off their dependence. As this obvious truth is known to men, even of an ordinary capacity, we cannot reaſonably ſuppoſe that ſo ſenſible, ſo ſpirited, and ſo free a people, as the Americans appear to be, can either be blind or inattentive to the firſt and greateſt principles of nature and government.

If the Coloniſts are Britiſh Subjects, they have an undeniable right to every indulgence and privilege, in the very ſame manner as if they reſided in Great Britain; for their *diſtance* makes no difference in the nature of things. Remoteneſs does not forfeit them the natural and conſtitutional rights of a free people; nor intitle us, who remain here, to excluſive privileges. If, therfore, they are equally free, which I believe was never diſputed, and ſubject to the ſame laws and government, it neceſſarily follows that they are

intitled

intitled to the very ſame benefits and advantages with us; and that the Americans are, from the ſame principles, as juſtly intitled to the bleſſing of induſtry, by eſtabliſhing *operoſe* manufactures, and by promoting a *foreign* commerce, as the reſt of his Majeſty's ſubjects who reſide in Great Britain. This is too obvious to admit of a diſpute, if we allow the Coloniſts to be Britiſh ſubjects, originally the natural-born ſubjects of Great Britain, in a ſtate of voluntary tranſportation or emigration, for the good purpoſes and the advantages of his Majeſty's dominions in general: And ſurely no man of ſenſe and candor will attempt to maintain, or ſuggeſt, that their emigration to plant colonies, at a great riſk and expence, *deprives* them of the bleſſings of conſtitutional liberty? To ſuggeſt that they *ſhould* be precluded from the bleſſings common to all in this vaſt commercial State, and which are the birth-right of every Britiſh ſubject, would be as abſurd as it would be unreaſonable and unjuſt. For my own part, I really think that the Americans are rather deſerving of *excluſive* privileges

vileges, for undertaking ſo great and arduous a work, than to be precluded and oppreſſed for bringing it to perfection.

The caſe of natural ſubjects who plant colonies, is widely different from the predicament of people who are ſubdued and obliged to ſubmit to the will of the conqueror. If, therefore, the coloniſts are upon a level with us in points of national privilege, and that they derive from the ſame conſtitution the very ſame rights and bleſſings, it ceaſes to be a matter of argument, whether the Americans ſhould be ſuffered to enjoy their natural, equal, and undeniable rights as Engliſhmen: but if they are *not* admitted as ſuch, in every reſpect, (which I believe has never been even doubted) then they have an undeniable right, which is natural to all people, to ſeek to promote their own intereſt and happineſs, by ſuch *means* as *they* beſt approve of; and, in that caſe, we certainly have no legal or juſt right to prevent their purſuing and endeavouring to attain thoſe great, neceſſary, and rational objects: ſo that, in either caſe, that is, whether they really

really are, or abſolutely are not, Britiſh ſubjects, they juſtly and evidently are intitled to the bleſſings of induſtry by the means of *operoſe* manufactures and a *foreign* commerce; without which great privileges of ſociety, they would, manifeſtly, be in a ſtate of greater *ſubjection* than many, and, perhaps, all people who live under arbitrary and abſolute governments.

I take this doctrine to be the *natural* principle, and the *equitable* courſe of things. POLICY is a conſideration of another kind; and indeed of ſo very different a complexion, that it is often thought to militate againſt the well known principles of nature and equity. It may, therefore, be good policy, in the opinion of ſome politicians, to weaken his Majeſty's *diſtant* dominions, and to oppreſs his *remote* ſubjects, in order to ſtrengthen his kingdom at home, and to gratify thoſe, who, from accident, not from ſuperior merit, are nearer to him; but who will venture to ſay that ſuch a partial gratification of the one part of his empire, at the expence of the other, is either natural, juſt, or politic in a *free* Country? A country

which ſhould adminiſter the ſame equitable laws, and impartially diſtribute the ſame bleſſings to all its ſubjects *far* and *near*.

The late Mr. Alderman TRECOTHICK, a well known American merchant, who had great *local* and *commercial* knowledge of that Country, was pleaſed to compare Great Britain and her Colonies, to an indulging mother and her dutiful daughters, as other very reſpectable and judicious gentlemen have done; and I think it was a favorite idea of the late Mr. Charles Townſend.

Upon this principle, gentlemen reaſon morally and not politically. The parallel is drawn from the feelings and virtues of human nature, and not from the neceſſity of modern policy; and therefore the compariſon does more honor to the heart than credit to the head of a politician, who ſhould remember that the *neceſſary* maxims of government are often, at leaſt, *apparently*, in direct contradiction to the rigid principles of morality. The moral mind does honor to human nature in private life, but, from contracted notions, may do great injury

injury in a public ſtation. Morality teaches a conſcientious regard to individuals, while good policy leaps over thoſe narrow bounds, and ſhews unanſwerably, that men ſhould chearfully ſubmit to the *ſalus populi*; it being reaſonable that private convenience ſhould cede to the ſecurity and welfare of the collective body: for whatever is for the good of the whole is moſt certainly, in its various and final operations, for the benefit of particular individuals; notwithſtanding it may ſometimes appear otherwiſe, when men look no further than into their own *immediate* views.

My Lord, if men, in general, were ſeriouſly and diſpaſſionately to conſider this, they would often have occaſion to bluſh at the haſty and raſh manner in which they condemn miniſters; who, paying a greater regard to the general operation of things, and to the ſalutary and ultimate ends of ſociety, generally merit a panegyric inſtead of the abuſe which rapidly flows, like a *common ſhore*, from the foul mouths of individuals, who regard their own convenience more than the general good, and

who deny to able miniſters that approbation which their impartial attention to the *whole*, juſtly deſerves from ſociety, which receives the benefit of their extenſive comprehenſion, and ſalutary meaſures.

With regard, my Lord, to the principles of nature and morality, which many acute gentlemen are pleaſed to think ſhould ſecure the affections and *filial* duty of the colonies; permit me to obſerve that the mother, in a natural and religious ſenſe, is certainly deſerving of the affections, gratitude and contributions of her daughters, in return for their exiſtence and ſupport, until they were brought to a ſtate of independence: This attention and return, ſhe deſerves, and may naturally expect from affection and gratitude: But who will ſay ſhe can claim it as a right? Gratitude is an obligation, but it does not conſtitute an abſolute right: much leſs ſhould that right be allowed when a better claim and a clearer title militates againſt it. Self-preſervation is the firſt law of nature, and the general preſervation the firſt principle of government. Other objects have their

degrees

degrees of merit, and ſome have a very large ſhare, but as all are inferior to theſe primary and ultimate ends of ſociety, and of the creation, ſo it is reaſonable they ſhould all cede to theſe maxims which are the leading and ruling principles with all men and with all ſtates. Neither do I expect that any man of ſenſe and candor will maintain, even upon *moral* principles, that the daughters ſhould give ſuch ſingular proofs of gratitude and affection, as to ſupport the mother, good as ſhe may be, *beyond their abilities*, and to their own ruin and deſtruction! But admitting, my Lord, to the very utmoſt latitude, every thing that can be ſaid in favor of gratitude and affection; in favor, I ſay, of the ſource from whence ſo many bleſſings ſpring, this truth is unanſwerable, and a full refutation of ſuch a claim on the colonies, viz. the *moral virtues* and *political neceſſity* are as widely different as the poles are oppoſite: The former teaches an eternal remembrance and acknowledgement of favors; while the latter maintains the propriety of it, *no longer than it ſuits one's purpoſe*: ſo that a

mora-

moralizing politician is quite as abſurd as a political moraliſt. It is quite as ridiculous for a ſtateſman to argue upon moral principles, as it would be for a parſon to preach politics.

Thus, my Lord, I can diſcover nothing *unnatural* or unreaſonable in the ſtruggle of the American colonies, (for any thing but *Independency)* which, like daughters in general, think it more immediately concerns them, to think of their *own* intereſt and preſervation, than to promote that of their antient mother upon *very hard* conditions. This will appear both natural and ſtrictly juſt, when we conſider that we have all implanted in our natures a principle of ſelf-love, which naturally influences and neceſſarily determines us to promote our own advantage, preferable to the intereſt and convenience of others. This great law of Nature and of Society, is not only juſtified, but recommended by the Chriſtian religion, which teaches that charity ſhould begin at home.

I allow that the great art of *preſerving* colonies, after they are well and uſefully planted,

planted, is, to make them *dependent* as much as poſſible on the mother country; but this, my Lord, is a very arduous taſk with a free and ſpirited people, who very juſtly think that *remoteneſs* does not deprive them of the bleſſings of their common, equal, and undeniable freedom. Therefore, what we find, by experience, cannot be done by *force*, ſhould be effected by *policy*. If we cannot oblige the Americans to TRADE where, and as we pleaſe, let us have the good ſenſe to ſecure the happy national conſequences of their free induſtry, and their extenſive trade; as *that* will anſwer the ſame ſalutary purpoſe, and perhaps a much better purpoſe than any unnatural and impracticable reſtrictions. I cannot, therefore, agree with thoſe men who maintain that, in order to ſecure the DEPENDENCY of the colonies, the Americans ſhould not be ſuffered to have *any* manufactures of their own, nor any *foreign* commerce; which *they* apprehend ſhould both be confined to Great Britain, as the great SOURCE of trade and navigation. Beſides, my Lord, as ſuch maxims

maxims of government would evidently deprive them of the moſt valuable objects of a trading people, and conſequently of their deareſt privileges as Britiſh ſubjects, it is, in my apprehenſion, impoſſible to put this doctrine in execution, with ſo enlightened a people as the Americans are univerſally allowed to be; or indeed with any other people, except thoſe who are conquered, or when colonies are in a ſtate of INFANCY; and then their *weakneſs*, not their *inclination*, obliges them to ſubmit to almoſt any thing that government may chooſe to impoſe on them.

It could, I believe, eaſily be proved, to a demonſtration, and to the full conviction of every capacity, that

1. It is impoſſible to keep the Americans without *manufactures* of their own.

2. As the ſucceſs and increaſe of manufactures will require a *foreign* trade, for what is more than ſufficient for their own conſumption, ſo it will alſo be abſolutely impoſſible to prevent that foreign trade, and therefore it would be both impolitic and dangerous to attempt it.

3. That

3. That it is not abſolutely neceſſary to prohibit either their eſtabliſhing of manufactures, or promoting a foreign commerce; nay, I do maintain (which is a bold aſſertion) that the permiſſion, or uninterupted liberty of exerciſing both, will be more conducive to the commercial and political intereſt of the mother country, than any reſtrictions or prohibition of manufactures and foreign trade in America.

As to the firſt proof; the extent of territory, the number of inhabitants, the increaſe of population, the neceſſity of providing for them, their knowledge and ſpirit of emigration, rouzed by the ſeverity of their governors, and the miſunderſtanding with our government; theſe, my Lord, and other powerful motives, makes it obvious that *manufactures* in America are abſolutely inevitable.

The ſecond proof follows in conſequence of the firſt; that is, it will neceſſarily follow, as the natural operation or effect of that ſpirit of induſtry and diſſatisfaction with Great Britain.

The third point I ſhall elucidate after a little digreſſion.

To bring the greateſt comforts to the heart (alluding to that doctrine which maintains that Great Britain ſhould be the SOURCE of manufactures and commerce) may be right in a phyſical ſenſe, but not in a commercial and political one: The body politic, in this caſe, differs from the body corporate. The parts of the latter are always the *ſame*, and ſo united and linked together like a chain, as not to be able to ſhake off their dependence; but it is not ſo with the former; for in politics, what was once the moſt inſignificant and the moſt dependent, may, by a ſtrange viciſſitude of things, be raiſed to the moſt valuable ſtation; for the ſeat of empire is not confined to any one place, but ſhifts about and fixes where there is the greateſt proſpect of ſucceſs and ſtability.

In my opinion, to make manufactures and commerce *ſpring* from Great Britain, and to *confine* the great bleſſings of induſtry at home, and to compel, in conſequence thereof, the Americans to ſubmit to it; to compaſs

compaſs theſe objects, which are manifeſtly unattainable, would be a maſterſtroke of policy for thoſe particular merchants who have, at preſent, great concerns or buſineſs in the colonies; but I apprehend it is neither juſt with regard to the Americans, nor a neceſſary ſtep to arrive at the great objects, and the ultimate aim of the Britiſh government. As I am ſenſible this doctrine will be ſtrongly oppoſed, I haſten to defend it.

I maintain, that the free and uninterrupted permiſſion of *manufactures*, and the carrying on a *foreign* trade, are ſo far from being detrimental and dangerous, in their conſequences, to the mother country, that I really think the conceſſion of thoſe great points would be conducive to the commercial and political intereſt of Great Britain. As this is an uncommon, and perhaps a very bold aſſertion, it requires a clear elucidation.

As all men of experience and candor allow that it is abſolutely impoſſible to reſtrain ſo numerous and ſo ſagacious a people as his Majeſty's American ſubjects,

from the free exerciſe of every ſource of induſtry that tends to promote their intereſt; then let us make a *virtue of neceſſity*, and grant them, by favor, what is really no more than their undoubted right, and which has never been, nor ever can be forfeited or alienated. Let us, I ſay, my Lord, grant them the free exerciſe of every privilege they are intitled to as Britiſh ſubjects; and allow them the undivided and uninterrupted enjoyment of every indulgence we enjoy ourſelves, and which they are indiſputably intitled to, as the *remote*, but *natural* ſubjects of this kingdom, in the ſame ſtate of freedom as ourſelves. In fine, let the Americans eſtabliſh *operoſe* manufactures, and carry on a *foreign* trade; where is the danger? The conſequence, it may be ſaid, will be this; they will import fewer articles from Great Britain; and, by carrying on a ſmaller trade with the mother country, they will employ leſs ſhipping, to the very great prejudice of our trade, manufactures, and navigation. In anſwer to theſe formidable objections, permit me, my Lord, to obſerve, that it will

will, in the firſt place, require many years before this can be brought to any degree of perfection; and then our ſupplying them with the *materials* of their manufactures, and taking their *produce* in exchange for ours, will always make it their intereſt to puſh trade with us to its utmoſt extent; and hence it is evident that we are in no *real danger*, either of loſing or diminiſhing the benefits of their commerce; which, being founded on reciprocal convenience, and the accompliſhment of mutual views, muſt be permanent, and attended with the moſt happy conſequences.

But my Lord, methinks I hear an opponent ſay that a *foreign* commerce will deprive us of a great part of the benefits of the American trade, which ſhould be *all* ſecured to us. To this I reply, that what may at firſt view create a jealouſy and appear prejudicial, and even deſtructive, will be found beneficial, and a matter of real joy, when viewed in a more extenſive light; that is, when we come to reflect on the co-operating cauſes and the conſequences, or the various operations of commerce, when trade

is

is unconfined and left intirely free. A foreign trade from and to America in *Britiſh-bottoms*, by extending commerce, will better promote the great ends of navigation, and not impede them, as they certainly muſt be impeded by confinement and reſtrictions, which are the very bane of commerce and navigation. This encouragement to the Britiſh navigation, is a very eſſential advantage to Great Britain; and, conſequently, a very great acquiſition: and will anſwer infinitely better (than the preſent imperfect plan) the great ends of navigation; which, though well intended, is either very defective or imperfectly executed.

I expect it will be objected, that the articles which the Americans may have occaſion to import from foreign countries will, of conſequence, not be imported in *ſo great a quantity as uſual* from the mother country. This appears very natural, and yet I very much doubt whether it will make any eſſential difference; becauſe, as a ſpirit of induſtry and commerce will greatly encourage and increaſe population

in

in that very extenſive country; ſo an infinite greater conſumption of things, in general, in proportion to that very great increaſe, will, in my opinion, compenſate for that *apparent* diſadvantage, and not only enable us to ſend as great a quantity of the *uſual* articles as formerly, but alſo a very great quantity of *others:* ſo that, upon the whole, that is, in the various cooperating cauſes, and their inevitable and innumerable conſequences, our trade with America will *increaſe* inſtead of declining; as might, with ſome ſhew of reaſon, be feared from their being permitted to manufacture, and to carry on a foreign trade in Britiſh bottoms; and our navigation will, moſt undoubtedly, be conſiderably benefited by granting theſe great privileges to the colonies. But theſe, my Lord, are not *all* the happy effects of ſuch a plan; there is ſtill a greater ſcource of advantage to Great Britain to be attended to; and that is, the ultimate operation, or the certain effect of the free and flouriſhing condition of his Majeſty's ſubjects in America, which will flow in various ſtreams into this country,

and

and which ſome miſtaken politicians are taking a great deal of pains to prevent; not, perhaps, from a badneſs of heart, or any averſion to the Coloniſts, but merely from contracted notions of commerce and politics; the various operations, directly and indirectly, of which great national objects require an enlarged mind, diveſted of the prejudices and paſſions of intereſted and partial reaſoners.

The great induſtry of the Americans, with regard to manufactures, commerce and navigation, will make them a flouriſhing and opulent people; and, in proportion as they grow wealthy by the natural and commendable means of induſtry, they will neceſſarily and inevitably raiſe a conſiderable public revenue for the exigencies of the mother country, by the duties and other well regulated contributions of their extenſive trade and commerce. This is the greateſt benefit that can poſſibly ariſe from the planting of Colonies. Nothing more can, either in reaſon, or conſiſtent with our own intereſt and honour, be required; becauſe, in fact, it is accompliſhing every

thing.

thing. If, by various obvious means, and by as many more which will follow as nataurally and eaſily as the effect muſt follow the cauſe, you *increaſe the uſual* ſources of trade and navigation with the Americans, and, after ſo doing, their *operations ultimately make you a* RESERVED FUND for the purpoſes of *this* ſtate, is not this effecting every thing that can be expected or deſired from colonies, or from any other part of his Majeſty's dominions? The great obſtacle to the peace and proſperity of the Americans, and to the dignity and intereſt of Great Britian, appears to me to be an *ill grounded jealouſy of the Colonies being* FREE *and* FLOURISHING. This, however, can only occur to men of ſmall natural parts and little undelated hearts, who forego many advantages themſelves becauſe they are unwilling that others ſhould *partake* of them. The freer, the happier, the more ſatisfied the Americans are, the more they will, the more they *muſt*, promote the ultimate end and aim of the mother country. By encouraging them, in this reſpect, you only give

them the power to contribute to your purpoſes: and *vice verſa*, diſcourage them, and you will as evidently, naturally, and effectually deſtroy, what you have in view, and what you expect from the trouble and expence of planting colonies. I do not mean to be a partial advocate for his Majeſty's American ſubjects, but an advocate for reaſon and common ſenſe. I admit there are, at preſent, evils in the colonies which ſhould be ſeriouſly attended to: but really I think they naturally ariſe from RELAXATION, and that that miſunderſtanding will more or leſs exiſt, until a proper plan of operations is fixed upon. Although they are culpable, the mother country is perhaps more blameable for delaying the neceſſary plan, and thereby laying a foundation for the ſhameful irregularities which are now ſo much and ſo juſt-complained of; but which, though juſt, ought to be imputed to its *true cauſe*, which perhaps will be found to ſpring from the mother country.

If therefore (ſubſequent to REPRESENTATION and LEGISLATION, which ſhould precede

precede as cauſe and effect) the regulations of CUSTOMS and other TAXATIONS are put upon the ſame footing in America as they are in England (a taſk neither unreaſonable nor arduous, if ſet about with judgment, and executed with a becoming ſpirit,) bearing a *due proportion* to the nature and true ſtate of things in the colonies, what reaſon will the mother country have to be jealous of their American manufactures and foreign trade? When it is evident, even to an ordinary underſtanding, that the flouriſhing condition of the Americans, will greatly facilitate the purpoſes, and ſpeedily promote the ends of our government, with regard to thoſe great national objects, trade, navigation and revenue.

Thus, my Lord, I maintain it to be very injudicious, and both unjuſt and impolitic, to think of ſecuring *all* the advantages of manufactures and *foreign* commerce to ourſelves. Impolitic it is, to the laſt degree, becauſe it will defeat the end propoſed; and inſtead of ſecuring *all* the benefits we ſhall, as is now very apparent,

loſe thoſe which we were once in poſſeſſion of. Every obſtacle in their way is moſt certainly and demonſtrably an obſtruction to thoſe points at which we aim, and which can only be attained, and permanently ſecured, by making the ROAD eaſy to thoſe who are to TRAVEL in it for our own purpoſes. The denial of the privileges and indulgencies common to all the ſubjects of this free ſtate, whether near or remote, is a doctrine founded on injuſtice and impolicy: a doctrine that would, at the ſame time, deprive our fellow-ſubjects, whoſe rights are as clear and well grounded as our own; I ſay it would deprive them of their natural and conſtitutional rights, and the nation, of the benefits which would flow, like the tide, where they properly ſettled, from their induſtry and commerce; which ought not to be reſtrained, but extended by all the methods by which it can poſſibly be extended; and it is no matter *how* that is brought about, provided it is, in the end, found conducive to the intereſt, not of ſome particular men, but of his Majeſty's ſubjects in general, and to the enrichment

of

of the ſtate, which will follow, of courſe; as the wealth of the nation is founded *on*, and is in proportion *to* the proſperity of his majeſty's ſubjects in general.

From what I have ſaid, my Lord, I think it manifeſtly appears, that all we have to do is, to make the Americans dependent on the mother country *legiſlatively*; when that is done, upon natural and permanent principles, every thing elſe will follow of courſe, as the natural effects of one great and good cauſe. To compaſs this great point, I apprehend, the Americans ſhould be made ſenſible, that the colonics are, though remote, a part of the Britiſh dominions; enjoying the ſame conſtitutional privileges, and ſubject to the very ſame reſtrictions and limitations as the inhabitants of Great Britain; and I make no manner of doubt, but ſo diſcerning a people as they ſeem to be, will chearfully ſubmit to the ſame limitations, if they are allowed the ſame indulgencies; that is, they will naturally acquieſce in every conſtitutional meaſure, which bears a juſt proportion to

their

their abilities to bear it; and to require more would be both unjuſt and impolitic.

To judge of the abilities of the colonies, and to ſettle a book of rates and mode of taxation in America, are the great points which are ſo much wanted to ſatisfy the Americans, and to anſwer the purpoſes of our government. For men, who are themſelves totally ignorant of theſe matters, to pretend to pitch upon *a judicious plan of* TAXATION is an abſurdity in terms, and as dangerous in its conſequences as it is ridiculous in itſelf: for as theſe are *local* circumſtances, it requires a local as well as a commercial knowledge of the colonies, of both which the brighteſt men here are either totally ignorant, or, at beſt, but ſuperficially acquainted, from the imperfect and ſometimes uncandid accounts of others, whoſe narratives are often defective through ignorance, and oftener from ſelfiſh and partial motives, which dictate their opinions, and guide their conduct concerning his Majeſty's American dominions. And ſince only thoſe perſons who *reſide* in the colonies, and who, by a thorough knowledge

ledge of the various ſources and operations of agriculture, manufactures and commerce, can judge with ſagacity, what burthens they can, and ought in reaſon and juſtice to bear; ſo none but ſuch intelligent perſons *reſiding in America* ſhould be left to determine points which ſo immediately and eſſentially concern the colonies, and which no other perſons certainly can be ſo well qualified to judge of.

The Americans being, therefore, the beſt and indeed the only proper and adequate judges of their own ſituation and circumſtances, I apprehend the coloniſts ſhould be regulated in matters of REVENUE or TAXATION by their own REPRESENTATIVES, as being the only competent judges of American SOURCES. And, I apprehend, that theſe REPRESENTATIVES of the people, in Britiſh America, ſhould be either triennial or ſeptennial; *one half* to conſiſt of their own free choice, and the *other half* of his Majeſty's council: this, with the reſerved power of appointing governors and officers, civil and military, would keep ſuch a ſuperiority on the ſide of the mother-country as,

I ap-

I apprehend would keep America in a ſtate of perfect ſubjection; and *that* ſubordination would, in my apprehenſion, be a ſufficient ſecurity againſt future fears of their INDEPENDENCY, as they would have no *local* power but that of taxation, or raiſing a revenue for the purpoſes of themſelves and the Britiſh government. This plan would be an apparent indulgence, though, in fact, no conceſſion at all in their favor; as the SHARE of repreſentation from the mother-country in the perſons of the King's council, and other perſons employed by this government, would throw ſuch a weight of influence in the ſcale of REPRESENTATION, as to leave the Coloniſts the name, without the power of REPRESENTATION and TAXATION.

Upon this principle, I imagine, things might be properly regulated and amicably ſettled, and a reconciliation both of men and meaſures ſoon take place between Great Britain and her colonies; without the leaſt violence on the one part, or the ſmalleſt reſiſtence of averſion on the other. The Americans would be pleaſed with the

the *appearance* of a conceſſion, and the *ſhadow* of authority, while Great Britain would always be in poſſeſſion of the *ſubſtance* or reality: and by pretending to cede to their wiſhes, would effectually carry all her points, and with the moſt gentle methods, impoſe, enforce, and ſecure SUBORDINATION, which is ſo eſſentially neceſſary to the preſervation and welfare of every ſtate and ſociety. The Americans being perſuaded, that, from ſuch a plan, they enjoy *all* the rights of Britiſh ſubjects, and that they have gained their favourite point of *taxing* themſelves, they would be pleaſed with the acquiſition, and at their notions of liberty or conſtitutional freedom; they would, thus pleaſed and ſatisfied, be quiet and good ſubjects; they would alſo have a ſpur to their induſtry, and a cement to their affections; and, by promoting their own peace and intereſt, they would chearfully and naturally contribute to the utmoſt of their power, to the neceſſities of the Britiſh government: An event which, I preſume, will never be peaceably and happily effected upon the

violent and abſurd principles which ſome haſty inconſiderate perſons would *force* upon America. Principles, my Lord, which flow from narrow minds, or from partial motives, and which are as prejudical to the Mother-Country as they are unjuſt to her Colonies. And here I beg leave to obſerve, that raſh adviſers againſt America are greater enemies to Great Britain than to the Colonies, for a very obvious reaſon, viz. becauſe violence againſt them will precipitate us. Precipitate the nation into an unnatural diſpute with the Colonies, and you not only loſe *your* property in *their* hands, but you alſo ſtop the *uſual* beneficial ſources of trade and navigation. WE ſhall be the greateſt ſufferers, for they have *little* to loſe. In this predicament we ſhould conſider whether the remedy of violence is not worſe than the diſeaſe; and whether we do not make a rod for ourſelves, by inflicting a puniſhment which WE ſhall feel more than them.

Theſe ſerious conſiderations will occur in a more copious and maſterly manner to the acute penetration of Lord North; from whoſe

whoſe excellent underſtanding and goodneſs of heart, the nation may reaſonably expect that every circumſtance will be duly weighed before any ſteps are taken, for fear the conſequences ſhould be more diſagreeable to the Mother-Country than to the Colonies. In the mean time, the enemies to his majeſty's American ſubjects, put me in mind of an obſervation of Tully, who judiciouſly ſays, that "there is not one "man in a thouſand (he might have ſaid "ten thouſand) capable of governing a "ſtate, and much fewer yet *who are able* "*to make trade and commerce uſeful and ad-* "*vantageous to it.*" By which it ſeems he thought commercial talents were ſcarcer, and more uſeful to ſociety then political abilities.

I ſhould ſooner have obſerved, that beſides the impoſſibility of Great Britain's being a competent judge of the *rate* of taxation for America, there is another very powerful motive for taxing the Colonies upon my principle, and that is, the remoteneſs and loſs of time, which will delay ſome meaſures, and totally defeat the

purpoſe of others. In fine, there cannot be two more powerful reaſons militating on the ſide of taxation *in* America, than our ignorance of their ſources for taxation, and our remoteneſs.

That great luminary, Lord Chatham, perplexed one half of the nation with his American politics. His Lordſhip maintained that legiſlation and taxation were diſtinct things; and that although Great Britain had an undeniable right to govern the Colonies, ſhe had none to tax them. The noble Lord, no doubt, laughed at thoſe who ſwallowed ſo great an abſurdity. A right to govern, implies a right to tax, or where is the uſe of governing? The very name of *Colony* implies a dependence, and that dependence implies a power of taxation, and every other authority neceſſary to ſecure the acquiſition, and to promote the intereſt of the whole. Lord Chatham could not be *ſerious*, becauſe his diſtinction between legiſlation and taxation is, in my opinion, a burleſque on common ſenſe, that expoſes the credulity of thoſe men who believe the great patriot more than

they

they believe the goſpel. Taxation follows legiſlation, as naturally as incapacitation does expulſion. I do not allow the Americans the right of taxation, but I plead for it as *conſequent* to legiſlation (like cauſe and effect) and as a favor, calculated to ſuit the convenience of America, and to anſwer ultimately the wiſe purpoſes of the Mother Country. There is a vaſt difference between an uncontrolable right, and a controlable conceſſion: Lord Chatham is pleaſed to inſiſt on the former, and I contend only for the latter. I plead alſo for legiſlation, on this very intereſting occaſion, becauſe I really think, that remoteneſs and locality require it; eſpecially as the conceſſion is not incompatible with the ſupremacy of this country; but on the contrary, by fixing things in their natural channel, it will re-unite us, and ſtrengthen the great bonds of friendſhip and dependency. To this great end, I preſume American *legiſlation* (for remote and local conſiderations) and conſequently American *taxation*,

tion, is calculated to promote the wiſe purpoſes both of that and this part of his Majeſty's dominions.

I wiſh to be underſtood, that I plead for legiſlation and taxation in America, as a neceſſary conceſſion, and not as a conſtitutional right.

The following were the ſentiments of the celebrated Mr. Pitt, on that important ſubject.

Mr. SPEAKER,

" When the reſolution was taken to *tax* America, I was ill in my bed; and when the *act* paſſed, I was alſo ill in bed."

" It is my opinion, that this kingdom has no right to lay a tax upon the Colonies; at the ſame time I aſſert the *authority of this kingdom, to be ſovereign and ſupreme in every circumſtance of government and legiſlation whatever*. They are the ſubjects of this kingdom, equally intitled with ourſelves to the natural rights of mankind, and the peculiar privileges of Engliſhmen, equally bound *by the laws*, and equally participating of the conſtitution; the Americans are the ſons, not the baſtards of England; but

but according to the conſtitution of this free country, *taxation* is no part of the *governing or legiſlative* power; the taxes are a voluntary gift and grant of the Commons alone; this houſe repreſents thoſe Commons, therefore, in this houſe we give and grant what is our own. But in an American tax what do we? We your Majeſty's Commons of Great Britain, give and grant to your Majeſty—what?—our own property? no, we give and grant to your Majeſty the property of your Commons in America." It is an abſurdity in terms; the diſtinction between *legiſlation* and *taxation* is eſſentially neceſſary to liberty."

" There is an idea in ſome, that the Colonies are *virtually* repreſented in this houſe; I would be glad to know by *whom* is an American repreſented here? is he repreſented by any knight of the ſhire of any county in this kingdom, or by the repreſentative of any borough, which perhaps was never ſeen by its repreſentative; a borough, which perhaps no man ever ſaw? The idea of a *virtual* repreſentation

of

of America in this houſe, is the moſt contemptible notion that ever entered into the head of man, it does not deſerve refutation."

" The Commons of America are repreſented in their aſſemblies only; they have ever been in poſſeſſion of this their *conſtitutional right*, of giving and granting their own money; they would have been ſlaves, if they had not enjoyed it."

" We have been told, that America has been obſtinate, that ſhe is almoſt in open rebellion. I rejoice that America has reſiſted. Three millions of people ſo deaf to all the feelings of liberty as to be content to be ſlaves, would have been fit inſtruments to make ſlaves of the reſt. None of the miniſters, from the acceſſion of King William, to the late King, ever dreamed of *robbing* the Colonies of this their *conſtitutional right*; it was reſerved to mark the preſent adminiſtration." Thus far this great orator's ſpeech.—

My Lord, I acknowledge that the meaning of this gentleman, is beyond my comprehenſion. That authority ſhould be

be ſovereign and ſupreme in every circumſtance of government and legiſlation, and yet *without* the moſt neceſſary power of taxation, appears to me ſuch an abſurdity, as eclipſes all other abſurdities. For in what conſiſts the power of legiſlation, or where is the uſe of government, without the great power of levying taxes for its ſupport, and the general welfare? Like cauſe and effect, I conſider taxation conſequent to, and inſeparable from legiſlation; and, in our peculiar ſituation, as neceſſary to the body politic as the ſoul is to the body corporate.

That the Americans ſhould be intitled to all the natural rights and the peculiar advantages of Engliſhmen, equally participating of the conſtitution, and bound by the laws, and yet exempted in the moſt eſſential object of government, is either a monſtruous abſurdity, or a refinement beyond my conception.

The Right Honourable gentleman attempts to explain this paradox, by obſerving that "according to the conſtitution of this "free country, taxation is no part of the

"governing or legiſlative power." But for my part, I never could conceive the difference between conſtitution and legiſlature; nor make any diſtinction between legiſlation and taxation; except that the one is the cauſe, the other the natural and neceſſary effect. Thus, when we are told, they are bound equally with ourſelves, by the laws, or the legiſlature which enacts thoſe laws; and, in the ſame breath, that they are exempted by their *conſtitutional rights*, I am amazed at the abſurdity: Becauſe, binding in all things, and exempting in the moſt eſſential, is a perfect ſoleciſm.

If taxation is no part of the legiſlative power of this free country, by what power are we obliged to pay ſuch heavy though neceſſary taxes? I know of no power but legiſlative authority that could impoſe them. But, ſays my opponent, taxes are a *voluntary* gift and grant of the Commons. The is a common error: For all laws are compulſive, and whatever is *required* for the ſupport of the ſtate cannot be voluntary. Money bills do certainly originate in the Lower Houſe; but nevertheleſs, like all other bills, they go through

through the ſame forms of the legiſlature, to make them legal. It is, therefore, an abſurd notion, to think, that money bills are voluntary grants of the Commons, when it is evident they are concurrent and compulſive acts of the whole legiſlature, for the ſupport of government.

If taxes are voluntary gifts of the Commons alone, or the conſtituent body, I ſhould be glad to know why their voluntary grants require the concurrence of the other branches of the legiſlature? If the Lower Aſſembly repreſents the Commons, or the Conſtituent body, it can only aſſent to their *ſhare* of the tax; it cannot make a voluntary grant of taxes on the eſtates of the Peers whom they do not repreſent. Hence is is evident, that taxes are not a voluntary grant of the Commons *alone*; but a neceſſary requiſition of government; to which, as both houſes contribute, ſo both concur, not voluntarily, but neceſſarily.

I heartily ſubſcribe to the doctrine of *virtual* repreſentation; and am thoroughly convinced, that although the Coloniſts

are not a part of the conſtituent body, ſo as to be repreſented by any county or borough in this kingdom, yet they are repreſented as legally and effectually as any part of England that does not ſend repreſentatives to the great national aſſembly. And as their remoteneſs renders it impoſſible for them to make a part of the body conſtituent, ſo they are virtually repreſented. If it ſhould be ſaid, that Ireland has repreſentatives of her own, I beg leave to make a very great difference between a well regulated *ſeparate* kingdom, and the Colonies of a nation, which have never been diſtinct nor intitled to any form of government but what was granted by the legiſlative power of Great Britain, to which they belong.

The Commons of America are, therefore, only a remote part of the Commons of Great Britain; which, on account of locality, not being any part of the conſtituent body, can only be virtually repreſented in England: Their own aſſemblies are a ſubordinate authority for their immediate regulation and good government; and as they can have no conſtitutional right, but what

what they receive from a participation of our form of government; ſo they are effectually included in, and repreſented by the Commons of Great Britain. And as they equally participate of our conſtitution, or form of government, ſo they are, equally with us, bound by the laws, or the governing or legiſlative power of this nation; the great object of which is *taxation*, for the general preſervation and welfare. Nothing, in my apprehenſion, can be ſo prepoſterous as to aſſert their being equally intitled with us to the rights and privileges of this free ſtate, and yet not ſubject to bear the ſame burthens in proportion to their circumſtances.

I contend that the laws or the legiſlative authority, extend to all his Majeſty's Dominions in Europe, Aſia, Africa, and America; and that ſuch parts of the Britiſh Empire, as, from remoteneſs, cannot be of the conſtituent body, are virtually and as effectually repreſented as the inhabitants of any Engliſh county or borough whatever.

If the Colonies of this nation have hitherto been indulged with aſſemblies of

their

their own, by the ſupreme governing power, that indulgence cannot be called *a conſtitutional right*; for Colonies (whoſe priviledges are derived) can have no conſtitutional right diſtinct from thoſe of the nation to which they belong, and of which they are a remote part.

They could not, therefore, have enjoyed that conſtitutional right, becauſe it is evident, they could not, in the nature of things, have been in poſſeſſion of it. Hence it is true, that "none of the miniſters from the acceſſion of King William to the late king ever dreamed of "*robbing* the Colonies of their conſtitutional right," becauſe it is manifeſt, they had no ſuch right to be *robbed* of. It was, therefore, reſerved for the preſent glorious reign, not to rob remote ſubjects, but to teach them that, as, in all things, they participate of the bleſſings of this free country, equally with us, ſo they are, in *all circumſtances* whatſoever bound by the ſame authority.

As a further proof in favor of *virtual* repreſentation of ſuch parts of his Majeſty's Empire as are neither in Great Britain

Britain nor Ireland, I beg leave to obſerve, that, whenever the Eaſt India Company's Charter expires their vaſt territorial acquiſitions will become the property of the crown; and be ſubject to ſuch form of government as the legiſlature ſhall judge moſt immediately conducive to their preſervation, and to the intereſt of this country. At that approaching, and happy period, thoſe dominions in the Eaſt will be virtually and effectually repreſented, as all acquiſitions muſt be that are remote from the conſtituent body.

If it ſhould be ſaid there is a vaſt difference between the *new* and the *old* acquiſitions of a country, I ſhould be glad to know in what it conſiſts? are they not equally a part of the nation, and equally ſubject to the ſupreme power? the chartered rights of America give them no ſuperiority; for thoſe charters, like all ſubordinate authorities, are ſubject to the power that created them. The conſtitutional rights of a free ſtate are ſacred; but the chartered rights of Colonies, will ever be in a ſtate of ſubordination to the conſtitution, or legiſlation of the kingdom

to

to which they belong. It is therefore an unpardonable error for a leading man boldly to assert, that the Americans, by resisting the necessary operations of government, in regard to taxation, resisted being slaves. Would they have been slaves for submitting to the same authority as we do, while they participate equally with us of the blessings of this free state? The assertion was very unjust, and exceedingly unfortunate at that period, because it has encouraged their resistance, which was then in it's infancy, and which would probably have subsided without the loss of blood or treasure on either side, had it not been for the propagation of such inflammatory principles, which are founded in the grossest error, and calculated to separate from this county her valuable Colonies, by a spirit of resistance and independency.

To conclude. My plan of conciliation is nothing more than the exertion of COMMON SENSE, which will teach us to have an attentive eye to our true interest, without being diverted from it by the passions of men, who either have not

a head to underſtand it, or a heart to promote that great object. Natural means will be eaſy and advantageous, while violent meaſures will be difficult, and perhaps will totally defeat the purpoſe, and deſtroy what we wiſh to preſerve.

It will, I hope, evidently appear, that I am not a party writer in this matter. Notwithſtanding I have a natural predilection for this my country, I am neither prepoſſeſſed in this cauſe in favor of the one ſide, nor prejudiced againſt the other. Men who preſume to ſuggeſt their opinion on national concerns, of great importance, ſhould do it with temper, and ſhew, as, I truſt I have ſhewn, that they are intirely diveſted of partiality and prejudice. I riſe, in the language of parliament, for the good of my country and for the honor of human nature; in me truth and juſtice ſhall never want a friend.

Legiſlation, taxation, manufactures and commerce being eſtabliſhed in the Colonies, upon my principles, America

will be happy and flouriſhing. A natural attention to theſe great objects, by keeping the Americans fully employed, will, in proportion as they love themſelves, neceſſarily eſtabliſh a judicious SUBORDINATION. Theſe deſirable events will rapidly flow from the ſource of meaſures founded on COMMON SENSE, as naturally as the effect follows the cauſe. They will ſoon reconcile the Mother Country to her Colonies. It is therefore evident that America muſt not be violently reſtrained. Shackle the Colonies and you render them uſeleſs and burthenſome. Deſtroy the fetters which are forging for the Americans, and, by leaving them the liberty to promote their own intereſt, they will inevitably contribute, by various means, to the ſupport and dignity of the Crown of Great Britain.

CORIOLANUS.

POSTSCRIPT.

IF it ſhould be thought by any paſſage in this production, that I have notions of *independency* which encourage the preſent oppoſition to the government of this country, on the other ſide the Atlantic, I deny it; and as I have always been a moſt zealous advocate for that neceſſary *ſubordination* which every ſtate neceſſarily requires of every *component* part of the nation; ſo I enter my proteſt againſt American ſtruggles for *independency* in the following words:

As the laws of ſociety cannot have any certain effectual operation, if the force of the ſociety (commonly called government) was not employed to ſupport them; there ariſes from thence, the neceſſity and reaſonableneſs of *authority*, which is the true and juſt foundation of all government.

As this mode of reaſoning is as applicable to every *component* part of a nation, as it is to every member of ſociety, ſo it neceſſarily follows, than an

oppoſition to legal government, which is the executive power of the ſtate, is inconſiſtent with the legiſlative authority (of whoſe excellency we ſo much boaſt) which neceſſarily and unavoidably reſts that power in a few for the advantage of all: It is alſo manifeſtly repugnant to the ſecurity of our rights, and deſtructive of all thoſe bleſſings which individuals wiſh to enjoy and to hand down to poſterity.

It is therefore as clear, as any mathematical demonſtration, that, whatever in the wild ſallies of their imaginations men of warm genius in America (under a notional and impracticable freedom, inſtead of rational and real liberty) may have advanced towards abſolute liberty and boundleſs freedom, it is a deluſion that tends to deſtroy the great ties of ſociety; to ſap the foundation of legal and neceſſary government; to remove the true and ſolid baſis of rational freedom; and the ſole foundation of all that can be ſtiled temporal happineſs; to gratify the ambition and paſſions of a few deſigning indivi-

duals,

duals, who are ſo far loſt to all ſenſe of public virtue and ſhame, as to ſacrifice the intereſt and happineſs of the whole community to their own purpoſes.

Nothing can be better underſtood, than the natural union of every *component* part of an empire. The beſt friends to government are thoſe men who endeavour to ſtrengthen that union, by ſhewing that the body politic, like the body corporate, can only ſubſiſt in its full luſtre and vigor by the union of every member or component part.

An oppoſition to government, or the executive power authoriſed by the legiſlative, is abſurd in its nature, and as dangerous in its conſequences to ſociety, as a revolution in the œconomy of the corporate body.

The Britiſh Colonies will therefore miſtake their intereſt and their permanent happineſs, if they continue their deluſive purſuit after abſolute liberty and boundleſs freedom, inſtead of that uſual, natural, and neceſſary dependence on Great Britain. That dependence is wiſe-

ly

ly calculated to preſerve the true foundation of general happineſs, or the ſolid baſis of rational and real liberty, inſtead of their preſent notional and impracticable freedom. Such a dependency alone can ſecure the national rights and the conſequent bleſſings of the Britiſh Colonies, and the ſupremacy of the Mother Country; from whoſe power every component part of the nation derives its exiſtence, ſtrength and wealth; on which they ſhould acknowledge their dependence; and from which, as the Colonies have derived their preſent flouriſhing condition, ſo they ſhould expect their future ſecurity and happineſs; Not as an independent ſtate, but as a part of this nation, which the very name of Colony implies.

We may therefore reaſonably hope, that the authors of American *independency* will ſoon recover from their dangerous deluſion, and return to a ſtate of peace and ſecurity. Theſe great bleſſings can only be found in their uſual dependency on this country, for the Colonies are

the

the indiſputable property of Great Britain; and conſequently an inſeparable part of the Britiſh Empire; ſubject to the legiſlative and executive powers of this nation, with no other difference in the legiſlation and government of his Majeſty's European and American dominions, than *remoteneſs* and *locality* may render abſolutely neceſſary, for the more immediate advantage of the Colonies and the conſequent intereſt and dignity of the Mother Country. This is the natural and neceſſary ſtate of things; and the foundation to which it is hoped they will ſoon be reſtored, for the advantage of the nation in general, and for the tranquility and dignity of as amiable a Sovereign as ever filled and adorned a throne.

FINIS.